United Nations A/C.3/63/SR.39

General Assembly
Sixty-third session

Official Records

Distr.: General
20 January 2009

Original: English

Third Committee

Summary record of the 39th meeting
Held at Headquarters, New York, on Tuesday, 11 November 2008, at 10 a.m.

Chairman:	Mr. Majoor	(Netherlands)
later:	Mr. Peralta (Vice-Chairman)	(Paraguay)
later:	Mr. Majoor (Chairman)	(Netherlands)

Contents

Agenda item 39: Report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, questions relating to refugees, returnees and displaced persons and humanitarian questions (*continued*)

Agenda item 58: Report of the Human Rights Council (*continued*)

Agenda item 62: Elimination of racism and racial discrimination (*continued*)

(a) Elimination of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance (*continued*)

Agenda item 63: Right of peoples to self-determination (*continued*)

Agenda item 64: Promotion and protection of human rights (*continued*)

(b) Human rights questions, including alternative approaches for improving the effective enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms (*continued*)

(c) Human rights situations and reports of special rapporteurs and representatives (*continued*)

(e) Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (*continued*)

Agenda item 61: Indigenous issues (*continued*)

Agenda item 97: Crime prevention and criminal justice (*continued*)

Agenda item 98: International drug control (*continued*)

This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate corrigendum for each Committee.

08-59682 (E)

The meeting was called to order at 10.20 a.m.

Agenda item 39: Report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, questions relating to refugees, returnees and displaced persons and humanitarian questions (*continued*) (A/C.3/63/L.56)

Draft resolution A/C.3/63/L.56: Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees

1. **Mr. Michelsen** (Norway), speaking on behalf of the Nordic countries and the other sponsors, said that the draft resolution was a consensus text. It reflected the text of the draft resolution adopted the previous year and underscored the responsibility of States for ensuring the international protection of refugees. He wished to make an oral revision to the text: in paragraph 26, the words "the impact of those flows of persons" should be replaced by "its serious impact". He hoped the draft resolution would be adopted by consensus.

2. **Mr. Khane** (Secretary of the Committee) announced that the following delegations wished to join the sponsors: Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Belarus, Benin, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burundi, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cyprus, El Salvador, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Honduras, Hungary, Iraq, Kenya, Lesotho, Malawi, Malta, Mauritania, Micronesia (Federated States of), Montenegro, Morocco, the Niger, Nigeria, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, the Republic of Korea, the Republic of Moldova, the Russian Federation, Senegal, Serbia, Sri Lanka, the Sudan, Tajikistan, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Turkey, the United Republic of Tanzania and Zambia.

3. **The Chairman** said that the draft resolution had no programme-budget implications.

4. **Mr. Khane** (Secretary of the Committee) said that the following States had joined as sponsors: Afghanistan, Azerbaijan, Bangladesh, Botswana, Cape Verde, Greece, Mauritania, Thailand and Uruguay.

5. *Draft resolution A/C.3/63/L.56, as orally revised, was adopted.*

6. **Mr. Butt** (Pakistan) said that his delegation wished to explain its position on paragraph 16 of the draft resolution, which referred to local integration as one solution to refugee problems. That solution was neither acceptable nor feasible in the case of Afghan refugees in Pakistan. The large number of those refugees and the protracted period of time involved had placed a heavy strain on Pakistan's resources. The refugees were beyond the absorption capacity of a developing country, particularly in view of the current food crisis; the best solution was safe voluntary return. The international community should also take its share of the burden, for instance through third-country resettlement. In so doing, it could help realize a new stability in the region.

Agenda item 58: Report of the Human Rights Council (*continued*) (A/C.3/63/L.47 and L.57)

Draft resolution A/C.3/63/L.47: Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights

7. **Mr. Salgueiro** (Portugal), introducing the draft resolution on behalf of the sponsors, said that the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela had been omitted from the list of original sponsors and announced that Azerbaijan had become a sponsor. The draft resolution constituted a landmark in the promotion and protection of human rights because it created a new international individual-complaint mechanism. In keeping with the view that all human rights were universal and indivisible, the proposed Optional Protocol would give economic, social and cultural rights, the rights that most directly affected individuals' daily life, the same status as that accorded to civil and political rights. The text was a consensus text which, he hoped, would be adopted by consensus.

8. **Mr. Khane** (Secretary of the Committee) announced that Honduras, Mongolia and Nicaragua had become sponsors.

Draft resolution A/C.3/63/L.57: Report of the Human Rights Council

9. **Mr. Amorós Núñez** (Cuba), speaking as a sponsor on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that were members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries and of the Group of African States, said that the draft resolution, in recognition of the work of the Human Rights Council, for example the drafting of the Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, took note of the report of the Council (A/63/53 and Add.1) and endorsed the recommendations contained therein. He was confident that the draft resolution would be adopted by consensus.

10. **Mr. Khane** (Secretary of the Committee) announced that Costa Rica wished to join the sponsors.

Agenda item 62: Elimination of racism and racial discrimination (*continued*)

(a) Elimination of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance (*continued*) (A/C.3/63/L.49)

Draft resolution A/C.3/63/L.49: Inadmissibility of certain practices that contribute to fuelling contemporary forms of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance

11. **Mr. Lukiyantsev** (Russian Federation), speaking on behalf of the sponsors, said that Belarus, Ethiopia, Kazakhstan, South Africa and Turkmenistan had become sponsors of the draft resolution, the theme of which was particularly relevant in the light of the forthcoming Durban Review Conference. He expressed profound concern at the growth of skinhead and neo-Nazi groups, attempts to glorify the Nazi movement or portray those who collaborated as members of national liberation movements, and the increase in the number of violent incidents attributable to those phenomena, which must be combated at the national and international levels.

12. He wished to make two revisions to the text: near the end of paragraph 2, the words "or collaborated" should be replaced with "and collaborated"; and in paragraph 12, the words "within existing resources" should be inserted following the word "prepare".

13. As the seventieth anniversary of the beginning of the Second World War approached and given the victory of the anti-Hitler coalition which had paved the way for the founding of the United Nations, it would be especially fitting for Member States to adopt the draft resolution by consensus.

14. **Mr. Khane** (Secretary of the Committee) announced that Cape Verde, Côte d'Ivoire, Nicaragua and Nigeria wished to join the sponsors.

Agenda item 63: Right of peoples to self-determination (*continued*) (A/C.3/63/L.48 and L.52)

Draft resolution A/C.3/63/L. 48: Universal realization of the right of peoples to self-determination

15. **Mr. Tarar** (Pakistan), speaking on behalf of the sponsors, said that the right to self-determination was the basic human right of nations and the very foundation for the enjoyment of all other human rights. It was enshrined in the International Covenants on Human Rights and had been reaffirmed at numerous international conferences. The exercise of that right had brought freedom to millions around the globe and offered hope to those peoples still under colonial, foreign or alien occupation. He said that Cameroon, the Congo, Mali, Somalia and Thailand had become sponsors and urged the Committee to once again adopt the draft resolution by consensus.

16. **Mr. Khane** (Secretary of the Committee) announced that the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya and Namibia had joined the sponsors.

Draft resolution A/C.3/63/L.52: The right of the Palestinian people to self-determination

17. **Mr. Khane** (Secretary of the Committee) said that the name of Palestine had been omitted from the list of sponsors.

18. **Mr. Attiya** (Egypt), speaking on a point of order, requested that a corrigendum to the draft resolution should be issued with the name of Palestine added to the list of sponsors.

19. **The Chairman** said that the Secretariat had taken due note of that request.

20. **Mr. Attiya** (Egypt), speaking on behalf of the sponsors, introduced the draft resolution, which recalled the long wait of the Palestinian people for their own State. Their right to an independent State had been affirmed on numerous occasions by the United Nations as well as by the International Court of Justice in the context of its advisory opinion on the Israeli wall in the West Bank. He said that Ecuador, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Montenegro, San Marino, Slovenia and Togo had become sponsors and urged the Committee to adopt the draft resolution by consensus, thereby sending a message of solidarity to the Palestinian people as they sought to assert their inalienable right to a sovereign and viable State with East Jerusalem as its capital, living in peace and security with Israel.

21. **Mr. Khane** (Secretary of the Committee) announced that the following delegations wished to join the sponsors: Bulgaria, Cape Verde, Costa Rica, Croatia, Guinea-Bissau, Haiti, the Republic of Moldova, Rwanda, Tajikistan, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Timor-Leste.

Agenda item 64: Promotion and protection of human rights (*continued*)

(b) Human rights questions including alternative approaches for improving the effective enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms (*continued*) (A/C.3/63/L.19/Rev.1, L.21, L.22, L.27, L.30-L.32, L.34, L.38 and L.39)

Draft resolution A/C.3/63/L.19/Rev.1: Moratorium on the use of the death penalty

22. **Mr. Jesus** (Angola) introduced draft resolution A/C.3/63/L.19/Rev.1 on behalf of the sponsors, which had been joined by Algeria, the Congo and Haiti, and said that a moratorium on the use of the death penalty would give Governments time to take measures aimed at abolishing the death penalty. His delegation therefore welcomed the holding of national debates on the death penalty in a number of countries. However, it was clear that such processes took time, because it was necessary to amend national legislation. Given the importance of General Assembly resolution 62/149, the draft resolution requested the Secretary-General to provide a report on its implementation at the sixty-fifth session of the General Assembly.

23. **Mr. Khane** (Secretary of the Committee) announced that the Dominican Republic had joined the sponsors.

Draft resolution A/C.3/63/L.21: Regional arrangements for the promotion and protection of human rights

24. **The Chairman** said that the draft resolution had no programme-budget implications.

25. **Mr. Nihon** (Belgium), introducing the draft resolution on behalf of the sponsors, made several oral revisions to the text. Paragraph 6 (e) should now read, "The recent decision by the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) to develop a mechanism for the promotion and protection of human rights;". A new subparagraph 6 (g) should be inserted, to read, "Ongoing initiatives to further develop arrangements for the promotion and protection of human rights by the States members of the Common Market of the South (MERCOSUR);". The former subparagraph 6 (g) should become 6 (h) and the former subparagraph 6 (h) should become 6 (i). In the new subparagraph 6 (i), after the words "Council of Europe", the words "and its various human rights bodies and mechanisms" should be inserted.

26. The following countries had joined the sponsors since the draft resolution had been introduced: Albania, Andorra, Australia, Canada, Chile, the Czech Republic, El Salvador, Japan, Malta and Turkey.

27. The draft resolution welcomed the exchaages between the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights and intergovernmental and regional bodies, as well as between the human rights treaty bodies and the relevant regional organizations. It also mentioned recent developments within ASEAN and in the MERCOSUR region.

28. **Mr. Khane** (Secretary of the Committee) said that the following countries had joined as sponsors of the draft resolution: Angola, Azerbaijan, Brazil, Cape Verde, the Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Ghana, Honduras, Indonesia, Israel, Liberia, Nigeria, Norway, Panama, Peru, the Republic of Moldova, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, the United Republic of Tanzania and Uruguay.

29. **Mr. Amorós Núñez** (Cuba), speaking in explanation of position, said that his country supported the draft resolution. Cuba also associated itself with paragraph 9, particularly the last part, but noted that the decision of the High Commissioner's Office to strengthen national protection had not taken into account intergovernmental agreements or the principle of consent for the High Commissioner's field operations. Furthermore, it applied to developing countries only, leaving aside the universality of human rights, and assumed that only developing countries needed support to strengthen human rights. Cuba would be watching closely to ensure that that deficiency was not repeated.

30. *Draft resolution A/C.3/63/L.21, as orally revised, was adopted.*

Draft resolution A/C.3/63/L.22: Combating defamation of religions

31. **Ms. Awino Kafeeo** (Uganda), introducing the draft resolution on behalf of the Organization of the Islamic Conference and the other sponsors, said that there had been a disturbing increase in xenophobia and racial violence. Such discrimination prevented individuals from exercising their basic human right to practise their religion freely without fear of reprisals. Given that the draft resolution denounced the defamation of all religions, it was regrettable that some

delegations had not expressed their support for it. That approach was surprising, given that all Member States had supported the United Nations Global Counter-Terrorism Strategy, which also aimed to prevent the defamation of religions, religious values, beliefs and cultures. Her delegation called on Member States to support the draft resolution and noted that a revised text would be issued.

Draft resolution A/C.3/63/L.27: Human rights and extreme poverty

32. **The Chairman** said that the draft resolution had no programme-budget implications.

33. **Mr. Pérez** (Peru) said that the following countries had joined in sponsoring the draft resolution: Argentina, Belarus, Colombia, the Congo, Cuba, Kuwait and Pakistan.

34. **Mr. Khane** (Secretary of the Committee) said that the following countries had joined as sponsors of the draft resolution: Andorra, Bangladesh, Barbados, Bhutan, Cameroon, Cape Verde, the Dominican Republic, Guinea-Bissau, Iraq, Kenya, Lesotho, Montenegro, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nigeria, Thailand and Tunisia.

35. *Draft resolution A/C.3/63/L.27 was adopted.*

36. **Ms. Phipps** (United States of America) said that, while her country joined the consensus on the draft resolution, it had some reservations. In the first preambular paragraph, the reference to reaffirming certain international instruments referred to the obligations of States parties under those instruments. It did not imply that States had obligations under human rights instruments to which they were not party.

37. Countries had primary responsibility for their own development. That was at the heart of country ownership and leadership. Principles which remained constant regardless of changing events or crises included not shirking commitments to good governance, sound policies and international support to national efforts towards sustained development and fighting poverty.

38. **Ms. Hoosen** (South Africa) said that extreme poverty and hunger were major challenges to developing countries, particularly in sub-Saharan Africa, and especially in view of the current food, energy and economic crises. Human rights and extreme poverty should be broadly defined to include such issues as marginalization, economic exclusion, lack of social cohesion and national integration, and elimination of racial discrimination. Regrettably, the draft resolution did not adequately deal with that. Extreme poverty could not be addressed effectively without the necessary linkages to development issues. The sponsors had failed to give due consideration to those issues.

39. There were also concerns regarding the terms of reference of the independent expert on the question of human rights and extreme poverty. Her mandate authorized her to assess the implementation of the Second United Nations Decade for the Eradication of Poverty without contextualizing a constructive environment in which it should take place. However, the Second Decade could not be meaningful without a clear programme of action setting out a vision with achievable objectives supporting concrete efforts to achieve the Millennium Development Goals and eradicate poverty. Any attempt to locate the mandate in processes peripheral to the work of the Human Rights Council was unacceptable and tantamount to "mandate creep". The draft resolution failed to address some core issues related to human rights and extreme poverty.

Draft resolution A/C.3/63/L.30: The right to development

40. **Mr. Amorós Núñez** (Cuba), speaking as a sponsor on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that were members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, introduced the draft resolution and recalled that the Declaration on the Right to Development confirmed that the right to development was an inalienable human right and the prerogative both of nations and of individuals. Given the urgent need to make further progress on the right to development, his delegation hoped that the United Nations would review the issue of establishing a legally binding instrument on the right to development; it also hoped that the Committee would adopt the draft resolution by consensus.

41. **Mr. Khane** (Secretary of the Committee) said that China, Côte d'Ivoire, Dominica and Somalia had joined the sponsors.

Draft resolution A/C.3/63/L.31: Human rights and unilateral coercive measures

42. **Mr. Amorós Núñez** (Cuba), speaking as a sponsor on behalf of the States Members of the United

Nations that were members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, introduced the draft resolution and said that some States still made use of unilateral coercive measures in contravention of the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States. Unilateral coercive measures impeded the full realization of social and economic development and hindered the well-being of the population in the affected countries, especially women and children. His delegation therefore called on all Member States to stop using such measures, which contravened international human rights law.

43. *Mr. Peralta (Paraguay), Vice-Chairman, took the Chair.*

44. **Mr. Khane** (Secretary of the Committee) said that China and El Salvador had joined the sponsors.

Draft resolution A/C.3/63/L.32: Enhancement of international cooperation in the field of human rights

45. **Mr. Amorós Núñez** (Cuba), speaking as a sponsor on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that were members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, introduced the draft resolution and said that increased international cooperation and dialogue would undoubtedly contribute to the promotion and protection of human rights. In addition, the promotion and protection of human rights should be regulated through a framework based on the principles of universality, non-selectivity, objectivity and transparency in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations. His delegation hoped that the draft resolution would be adopted by consensus.

46. **Mr. Khane** (Secretary of the Committee) said that China and El Salvador had joined the sponsors.

47. *Mr. Majoor (Netherlands) resumed the Chair.*

Draft resolution A/C.3/63/L.34: Elimination of all forms of intolerance and of discrimination based on religion or belief

48. **Ms. Gasri** (France), speaking as a sponsor on behalf of the European Union, introduced the draft resolution and said that the sponsors had been joined by Argentina, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Costa Rica, El Salvador, Liechtenstein, San Marino and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of). The aim of the draft resolution was to provide a global approach to the implementation of all human rights instruments aimed at eliminating discrimination based on religion or belief and to support the mandate of the Special Rapporteur on freedom of religion or belief. It was essential that Member States should step up their efforts to guarantee freedom of belief by promoting education and dialogue. Her delegation hoped that the draft resolution would be adopted by consensus.

49. **Mr. Khane** (Secretary of the Committee) said that the sponsors had been joined by Albania, Benin, Cape Verde, Colombia, Cyprus, Ecuador, Guatemala, Honduras, Montenegro, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Panama, the Philippines, the Republic of Korea, the Republic of Moldova and Serbia.

Draft resolution A/C.3/63/L.38: Protection of migrants

50. **Ms. Rovirosa** (Mexico) introduced the draft resolution on behalf of the sponsors, which had been joined by Belarus, Colombia, Honduras, Kyrgyzstan, Lebanon, Tajikistan and Uruguay. The draft resolution urged States to promote and protect the human rights of all migrants, irrespective of their legal status, and expressed concern that the measures adopted by some States did not fully respect those rights. States were requested to adopt measures to protect the human rights of migrants in transit and to make every effort to keep families together. The draft resolution welcomed the measures taken by some States that allowed migrant families to integrate into the host countries within a framework of harmony, tolerance and respect. Her delegation hoped the draft resolution would be adopted by consensus.

51. **Mr. Khane** (Secretary of the Committee) noted that the following States had joined in sponsoring the draft resolution: Algeria, Armenia, Benin, the Comoros, Côte d'Ivoire, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Ghana, Guinea, Haiti, Iraq, Morocco, Nigeria, Sri Lanka and the Sudan.

Draft resolution A/C.3/63/L.39: Protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms while countering terrorism

52. **Ms. Rovirosa** (Mexico), introducing the draft resolution on behalf of the sponsors, said that Brazil, Canada, Colombia, Costa Rica, the Dominican Republic, Hungary, Israel, Mali, Malta, Nicaragua, Paraguay, Senegal, Serbia and Uruguay had joined the sponsors.

53. She said that the need to protect the population from terrorism did not justify the suspension of human rights, which should be the basis for any counter-terrorism measures. The draft resolution furthered that aim by calling for the continued implementation of the United Nations Global Counter-Terrorism Strategy; recognizing the need to continue ensuring fair and clear procedures in the United Nations sanctions regime; and welcoming the Security Council's review of the Consolidated List. She hoped that the draft resolution would be adopted without a vote.

54. **Mr. Khane** (Secretary of the Committee) said that Albania, Angola, Armenia, Benin, Cape Verde, Côte d'Ivoire, Cyprus, Iceland, Indonesia, Iraq, Montenegro, Nigeria, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) had joined the sponsors.

(c) Human rights situations and reports of special rapporteurs and representatives (*continued*) (A/C.3/63/L.26 and L.33)

Draft resolution A/C.3/63/L.26: Situation of human rights in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea

55. **Mr. Fieschi** (France), introducing the draft resolution on behalf of the European Union, Japan and the other sponsors, said that despite some positive signs, large-scale systematic violations of human rights continued to take place in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. The draft resolution urged that State to, inter alia, ensure that those responsible for violations were brought to justice, tackle the root causes of refugee outflows, and cooperate with the relevant international human rights mechanisms. He urged all Member States to draw attention to the problem, and hoped that the draft resolution would gain the widest possible support.

56. **Mr. Khane** (Secretary of the Committee) said that Montenegro had joined the sponsors.

Draft resolution A/C.3/63/L.33: Situation of human rights in Myanmar

57. **Ms. Gasri** (France), speaking on behalf of the European Union and the other sponsors, said that the draft resolution strongly called on the authorities of Burma/Myanmar to respect human rights and cooperate fully with human rights organizations.

58. **Mr. Han** (Myanmar), speaking on a point of order, asked the Chairman to request speakers to use the official name of his country.

59. **The Chairman** reminded all delegations to use the official names of countries when referring to Member States.

60. **Ms. Gasri** (France), continuing her statement, said that, despite some positive measures, previous United Nations resolutions on the issue had not been implemented. A wide range of human rights abuses continued to take place in the State in question, and no measures had been taken to prosecute those responsible for the violent repression of peaceful demonstrations. She therefore hoped that the General Assembly would take action once again.

61. **Mr. Khane** (Secretary of the Committee) said that Montenegro had joined in sponsoring the draft resolution.

(e) Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (*continued*) (A/C.3/63/L.37)

Draft resolution A/C.3/63/37: Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities and the Optional Protocol thereto

62. **Mr. Khane** (Secretary of the Committee), presenting a statement of programme-budget implications of the draft resolution in accordance with rule 153 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, said that the Secretariat had informed the Third Committee in an oral statement at the sixty-first session that the financial implications of the entry into force of the Convention during the biennium 2008-2009 would be $1,511,200. In paragraph 23.15 of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2008-2009 (A/62/6 (Sect. 23)), the Secretary-General had informed the General Assembly that the estimates for section 23 were likely to be revised during the current biennium as a result of entry into force of the Convention.

63. The Secretariat was currently finalizing the resource requirements of the departments responsible for implementing of the Convention and to service the Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities established under the Convention. The revised estimates for all the sections concerned, particularly, sections 2, 23, 28D and 28E, which would include the estimated requirements under the programme budget

for the biennium 2008-2009 and the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2010-2011, would be submitted shortly to the General Assembly.

64. With regard to paragraph 8 of the draft resolution, attention was drawn to section VI of General Assembly resolution 45/248 B, in which the Assembly reaffirmed that the Fifth Committee was the appropriate Main Committee entrusted with responsibilities for administrative and budgetary matters and reaffirmed the role of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions.

65. **Ms. Rovirosa** (Mexico) said that the following countries had joined in sponsoring the draft resolution: Algeria, Angola, Bangladesh, Barbados, Bolivia, Cambodia, Cape Verde, Côte d'Ivoire, Cyprus, Ethiopia, Ghana, Greece, Indonesia, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, Latvia, Liberia, Madagascar, Malawi, Mauritius, Montenegro, Morocco, Nigeria, the Philippines, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, South Africa, Suriname, Swaziland, Togo, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, the United Republic of Tanzania and Yemen. The Convention had been signed in record time by 136 States and ratified by 41. It affirmed the commitment of the international community to promote the human rights of all persons with disabilities.

66. **Mr. Khane** (Secretary of the Committee) said that the following countries had joined as sponsors: Burkina Faso, the Comoros, Egypt, Guinea-Bissau, the Niger and Zambia.

67. *Draft resolution A/C.3/63/L.37 was adopted.*

Agenda item 61: Indigenous issues (*continued*) (A/C.3/63/L.17/Rev.1)

Draft resolution A/C.3/63/L.17/Rev.1: Indigenous issues

68. **Ms. Taracena Secaira** (Guatemala), introducing the draft resolution on behalf of the sponsors, said it was important to foster dialogue between the Committee and the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights and fundamental freedoms of indigenous people. During negotiations, many delegations without representation in Geneva had stressed their particular need for such dialogue. The new paragraph 2 would extend involvement in the midterm assessment to every Member State with indigenous people, the relevant United Nations organizations and mechanisms, indigenous groups and other stakeholders. Paragraph 3 had been introduced during negotiations in order to further involve indigenous groups in the process. She hoped that Member States would support the United Nations Voluntary Fund for Indigenous Populations.

69. She said that Cuba, France, Hungary, Sweden and Uruguay had joined the sponsors.

70. **Mr. Khane** (Secretary of the Committee) noted that the following States had also joined the sponsors: Belize, Benin, the Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Cyprus, Dominica, Iraq, Madagascar, the Philippines and Slovenia.

Agenda item 97: Crime prevention and criminal justice (*continued*) (A/C.3/63/L.10/Rev.1)

Draft resolution A/C.3/63/L.10/Rev.1: Strengthening the United Nations Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice Programme, in particular its technical cooperation capacity

71. **Mr. Khane** (Secretary of the Committee), presenting a statement of programme-budget implications, said that his remarks concerned paragraphs 12, 13, 16 and 18 of the draft resolution. In reference to the request in paragraph 12, the resources to provide the required support to the conferences of the parties to the two conventions were included in the programme budget for the biennium 2008-2009 under section 2, General Assembly and Economic and Social Council affairs and conference management and section 16, International drug control, crime and terrorism prevention and criminal justice. The initial appropriation for the biennium for section 16 was $56,819,000.

72. The requests contained in paragraph 13 of the draft resolution would call for an increase in technical assistance to strengthen international cooperation in preventing and combating terrorism. Implementation of the activities laid out in paragraph 13 would be subject to the availability of extrabudgetary resources. Accordingly, adoption of the draft resolution would not give rise to any financial implications under the programme budget for the biennium 2008-2009. Paragraphs 12, 16 and 18 dealt with budgetary and administrative questions, which were the prerogative of the Fifth Committee.

73. **Mr. Mantovani** (Italy), speaking on behalf of the sponsors, said that organized crime interfered with or

superseded the normal functioning of public institutions, altered the functioning of the market and impacted legitimate economic activities. Its transnational dimension made it necessary for States to coordinate their response. The United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime was the first international instrument to fight that scourge. The purposes of the draft resolution were to highlight the importance of the fight against transnational organized crime and to reaffirm the support of Member States for the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime. Innovations in the draft resolution included references to conferences and resolutions on combating terrorism, human trafficking, cybercrime and violence against women.

74. **Mr. Khane** (Secretary of the Committee) said that the following countries had joined as sponsors of the draft resolution: Albania, Algeria, Angola, Armenia, Bangladesh, Belarus, Benin, Cape Verde, the Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, the Dominican Republic, Egypt, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Ghana, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Indonesia, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, Montenegro, Morocco, Namibia, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, the Philippines, the Republic of Korea, the Republic of Moldova, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, the Sudan, Swaziland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, the United Republic of Tanzania and Uruguay.

75. *Draft resolution A/C.3/63/L.10/Rev.1 was adopted.*

76. **Ms. Giménez-Jiménez** (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela) said that her country had joined the consensus but had reservations regarding certain references in the preamble and in paragraph 3: there should be no direct link between terrorism and organized crime, because they had different motives. As a result, there was a disregard for due process and for the presumption of innocence in the draft resolution.

77. **Mr. Emadi** (Islamic Republic of Iran) said that his country had joined the consensus. However, in reference to paragraph 4, it was not necessary or appropriate to incorporate the reference to regional organizations with limited membership into General Assembly resolutions, including the one just adopted. The recommendations of regional organizations could not be regarded as obligatory for States which did not belong to those organizations.

Agenda item 98: International drug control (*continued*) (A/C.3/63/L.8/Rev.1)

Draft resolution A/C.3/63/L.8/Rev.1: International cooperation against the world drug problem

78. **Mr. Khane** (Secretary of the Committee), presenting a statement of programme-budget implications, said that his remarks concerned paragraphs 27, 30, 38, 41 and 42 of the draft resolution. Implementation of the activities enumerated in paragraphs 27, 30 and 41 would entail the provision of technical assistance funded from extrabudgetary resources. The Executive Director of the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime had stated that extrabudgetary resources for the biennium 2008-2009 were projected at $30 million more than for the previous biennium.

79. In reference to paragraphs 38 and 42, the General Assembly had approved increased regular-budget resources under section 16 of the programme budget, which included the establishment of a new P-2 post in the secretariat of the International Narcotics Control Board. Hence, the draft resolution would entail no further appropriation for the biennium 2008-2009.

80. **Ms. Rovirosa** (Mexico), speaking on behalf of the sponsors, said that the following countries had joined as sponsors: Antigua and Barbuda, the Dominican Republic, Guyana, Honduras, Indonesia, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Slovakia, the Sudan, Sweden and Uruguay.

81. She said that, in combating the scourge of drugs, the international community must respect the principles of sovereignty, territorial integrity and the legal equality of all States.

82. **Mr. Khane** (Secretary of the Committee) said that the following countries had joined as sponsors: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Armenia, the Bahamas, Bangladesh, the Comoros, the Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Cyprus, Egypt, Eritrea, Iceland, Iraq, Israel, Jamaica, Japan, Lesotho, Liberia, Lithuania, Mali, Montenegro, Morocco, the Republic of Korea, the Republic of Moldova, Sierra Leone, Swaziland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and the United Republic of Tanzania.

83. *Draft resolution A/C.3/63/L.8/Rev.1 was adopted.*

84. **Mr. Salov** (Russian Federation) said that, while his country had decided to support the consensus on

the draft resolution, it would not join as a sponsor. Yet again, the issue of strengthening international cooperation to halt the global threat of narcotics production in Afghanistan was not adequately reflected in the draft resolution. Over the past two years, the resolutions had moved away from support for international cooperation in resolving the worldwide drug problem, with references to international cooperation disappearing from the text.

85. It was disappointing that the draft resolution contained no reference to support for future efforts to combat opium-poppy cultivation in Afghanistan and trafficking in narcotics originating in Afghanistan. It was not simply a question of singling out a particular country for mention; given the share of the global narcotics market occupied by opiates from Afghanistan, as well as the continued expansion of narcobusiness and terrorism there, the threat from Afghanistan was in fact global in nature. To underestimate it would be a serious error.

86. Likewise, it was a mistake not to refer in the draft resolution to Security Council resolution 1817 (2008), on the situation in Afghanistan, in which the Security Council had, for the first time, called upon Member States to strengthen the monitoring of the international trade in chemical precursors.

87. **Mr. Pak** Gil Yon (Democratic People's Republic of Korea), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that his country totally rejected draft resolution A/C.3/63/L.26, entitled "Situation of human rights in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea", introduced by France on behalf of the European Union. It was a product of political fraud and lacked all objectivity and fairness. Systematic human rights abuses of the type described in the draft resolution were non-existent. People in his country fully enjoyed their human rights.

88. If the European Union was truly interested in protecting human rights worldwide, they should question the daily killing of innocent people in Afghanistan, Iraq and the Occupied Palestinian Territories. With the universal periodic review currently operational, the country-specific draft resolution was an example of anachronistic, cold-war thinking. The sponsors should cease submitting resolutions which led to confrontation and mistrust, and other Member States were urged to reject such overly politicized resolutions.

The meeting rose at 1.30 p.m.